

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-20, 22-37 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 14, and 23-31 have been amended while claims 9, 11 and 21 have been cancelled as shown on pages 3-7 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated on page 2. New claim 37 has been added. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as filed at page 7 lines 15-17, page 8 line 29-page 9 line 2, page 9 line 21-28 and page 10 lines 5-10.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Salomon and the Supervisory Primary Examiner James Myhre for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of April 10, 2007. The merits of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 and in view of the cited references were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Objection of Claims 24-29**

Claims 24-29 are objected to because they are recited as method claims dependent on a claim 23 that recites a medium. Withdrawal of this objection is requested in view of the aforementioned amendments to these claims.

#### **II. Objection of Claim 11 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)**

Claim 11 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Withdrawal of this objection is requested in view of the cancellation of the claim.

#### **III. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, 11-16, 19-23, 25, 28-31, 33 and 36 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, 11-16, 19-23, 25, 28-31, 33 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Scully, *et al.* (U.S. 4,831,552). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scully, *et al.* fails to describe each and every feature set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The subject claims are directed towards a computer executable system and method for generation of documents such as meeting preparation reports that compiles information about the meeting including information about the recipients based on social relationships that is helpful in preparing for the meeting. The report includes besides other information, how the attendees relate to each other. For example, the system creates an event document wherein event information is structured according to one or more of a company organizational chart or grouped according to functions (*See* applicants' specification page 2 lines 4-11). Accordingly independent claims 1, 14, 23 and 31 recite similar features namely: *the event document which is formatted to present the event information according to one of a company organizational chart wherein profiles of prospective attendees are arranged hierarchically according to a level of responsibility within an organization or a roundtable chart wherein attendee profiles are accommodated in a circle on the event document.*

Scully, *et al.* relates to an electronic calendaring method for assisting a calendar owner to request the system to develop and display a composite calendar comprising entries from a plurality of calendars within a specified time span which have been selected by criteria entered interactively into the system by the calendar owner (*See* Scully, *et al.* Abstract). Various search criteria other than free time are collected from a user and a subset of calendar entries satisfying such criteria is displayed. At various portions of the Office Action dated February 13, 2007 it is erroneously contended that Scully, *et al.* teaches formatting event information to reflect a company organization (*See* subject Office Action page 4 lines 7-8, page 5 comments relating to claim 21 *etc.*) At the cited portion Scully, *et al.* teaches how a department manager would coordinate the electronic calendars of all the twelve members of his departments to schedule a meeting. However, nowhere does the cited document teach or suggest arranging event

information within an event document based on various formats such as an organization structure or a roundtable format *etc.*

As stated *supra*, employing various formats such as those recited in the subject claims, leverages the power of social network analysis to help a user quickly prepare for a meeting by generating a meeting document structured in accordance with various social criteria associated with the event attendees. For example, the event document may arrange attendee profiles based on organizational hierarchy or a circular pattern hence reflecting a social relationship between the members attending a meeting. In another aspect, the profiles may be formatted based on an organizational chart distance of the attendees from a user who prints the event document hence the attendees who are familiar to the user are printed lower as compared to those who are unfamiliar. This facilitates a user to prepare for a meeting by quickly scanning the event document for unfamiliar attendees. Such novel aspects are not taught or suggested by Scully, *et al.*

In view of at least the aforementioned, it can be concluded that Scully, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest an identical invention as recited in the subject claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 10, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 4, 5, 10, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully, *et al.* in view of Doss (US 2003/0046296 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to generating an event document that summarizes topics of a meeting or event, the attendees, how the attendees relate, their motivations, and what the attendees may be looking for from the meeting. The report can be formatted to structure event information in various ways such as hierarchical or a roundtable format. The subject claims depend from independent claims 1, 14, 23 and 31. As stated *supra*, Scully, *et al.* fails to describe all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Doss fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency with respect to these independent claims. Doss relates to providing dynamic contact information to instant messaging (IM) systems and electronic status boards but fails to teach or suggest structuring event information in accordance with various criteria recited in the subject

independent claims. Therefore, the subject matter as further recited in claims 4, 5, 10, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 is not obvious over a combination of the cited documents. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully, *et al.* in view of Estrada (US 7,012,627 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to generation of documents such as meeting preparation reports that compiles information about the meeting including information about the recipients based on social relationships that is helpful in preparing for the meeting. The report can be formatted to structure event information in various ways such as hierarchical or a roundtable format. The subject claims depend from independent claims 1, 14 and 31. As stated *supra*, Scully, *et al.* fails to describe all aspects set forth in the subject independent claims. Estrada relates to providing an improved visual display for rooms in collaboration space displayed at a user browser and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Scully, *et al.* with respect to these independent claims. Therefore, the subject invention as further recited in claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 is not obvious over a combination of the cited documents. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP658US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731